

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 29, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

Turning first to the objections to the drawings, attached to this submission is a proposed revised version of FIG. 4, showing changes marked in red. Specifically, the lead line locations of reference numbers 28 and 116 have been corrected as kindly suggested by the Examiner.

Turning next to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness, the claims have been amended to recite that the valve chambers are defined by the housing, in response to the Examiner's suggestion. Further, the recitation of chambers have been reviewed and adjusted as necessary to more consistently recite first and second valve chambers. The references to upper and lower chambers have been removed. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the above noted objections and rejection be withdrawn.

Turning next to the rejections of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 1029(b) as being anticipated by Oliver et al., without conceding the propriety of this rejection, claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter generally corresponding to now cancelled dependent claims 2 and 3. Thus, the rejection claims 1 and 2 are believed rendered moot.

Turning to the rejections of claims 3 and 6, it is noted that the Office Action correctly identifies that Oliver et al. fails to specify a second strainer chamber detachably mounted to the housing. While the reference to Elliott does disclose "a casing or shell of the strainer, which may be conveniently formed in two sections, as shown, said sections being attachable by the bolts 3, or other suitable means", it is respectfully submitted that Elliott does not suggest the presently claimed combination. If the right side of the housing in FIG. 3 of Elliott is taken to be

one of the strainer chambers, it is noted that that chamber would have valves (not ball valves) attached thereto. The other side of the housing, the left side, has a strainer and also the inlet and outlet valves. It is respectfully submitted then, that Elliott does not teach or suggest the combination of: (1) claimed housing which has inlet and outlet ports and a first strainer chamber, a well as first and second valve chambers, provided in combination with (2) a detachable second strainer chamber as recited in amended claim 1.

Claim 7 is newly added and independent consideration of this claim is respectfully requested. Claim 7 depends from claim 1 is believed allowable for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. However, it is noted that claim 7 recites additional patentable features in its own right. Specifically, claim 7 further recites that the first strainer chamber, the first valve chamber and the second valve chamber are all formed at least partially unitarily with the housing. As is described above with respect to claim 1, Elliott is not believed to show such a structure, and therefore any proposed combination of Elliott with Oliver et al. it is believed to not overcome the deficiencies in Oliver et al. which show an entirely unitary housing having both strainer chambers.

The rationale for the rejection of claim 6 on pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action is not well understood, as it seems to refer to detachable mounting of the second strainer chamber. Since amended claim 1 includes this limitation formally presented in claim 3, the rejection of claim 3 is respectfully traversed and it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the art of record.

Turning to the remaining art rejections, Applicant respectfully requests some clarification as to the basis of the various rejections. For example, at pages 5 and 6 it appears that claim 6 is

being rejected as unpatentable over Oliver et al. in view of Elliott, but on pages 10 through 13 claim 6 appears to be rejected unpatentable over Oliver et al. in view of Rea et al. and Elliott. It is unclear whether the Examiner is applying Ray et al. to the rejection of claim 6. In any event, the arguments made in the amendment previously filed on February 14, 2005 are relied on by the Applicant and are intended to be reasserted herein. The arguments are not represented here, but the Examiner is kindly referred to the amendment filed February 14, 2005 for the applicant's basis of argument of claim 6. Turning to claims 4 and 5, the Applicant also relies on the arguments presented in the February 14, 2005 amendment with respect to those claims.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the application is believed in order, and such action is honestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Leo J. Jennings
Reg. No. 32,902

Date: 8/15/05
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5304
Telephone: 202-861-1500
Facsimile: 202-861-1783

